arXiv:1612.02090v1 [stat.ME] 7 Dec 2016

Nonparametric Tests for Treatment Effect Heterogeneity with Duration Outcomes

Pedro H. C. Sant'Anna*

Vanderbilt Univeristy

December 8, 2016

Abstract

This article proposes different tests for treatment effect heterogeneity when the outcome of interest, typically a duration variable, may be right-censored. The proposed tests study whether a policy 1) has zero distributional (average) effect for all subpopulations defined by covariate values, and 2) has homogeneous average effect across different subpopulations. The proposed tests are based on two-step Kaplan-Meier integrals, and do not rely on parametric distributional assumptions, shape restrictions, nor on restricting the potential treatment effect heterogeneity across different subpopulations. Our framework is suitable not only to exogenous treatment allocation, but can also account for treatment noncompliance, an important feature in many applications. The proposed tests are consistent against fixed alternatives, and can detect nonparametric alternatives converging to the null at the parametric $n^{-1/2}$-rate, n being the sample size. Critical values are computed with the assistance of a multiplier bootstrap. The finite sample properties of the proposed tests are examined by means of a Monte Carlo study, and an application about the effect of labor market programs on unemployment duration. Open-source software is available for implementing all proposed tests.

Keywords: Causal inference; Duration data; Empirical Process; Kaplan-Meier; Survival Analysis

*Pedro H. C. is an Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Vanderbilt University, VU Station B #351819, 2301 Vanderbilt Place, Nashville, TN 37235-1819 (e-mail: pedro.h.santanna@vanderbilt.edu). Financial support from the Spanish Plan Nacional de I+D+I (Grant No. ECO2012-33053 and ECO2014-55858-P) is acknowledged. This article is a revised version of the earlier draft entitled "Nonparametric Tests for Conditional Treatment Effects with Duration Outcomes". The author thanks seminar participants at many seminars/conferences for helpful comments and discussions.

1 Introduction

Assessing whether a policy or treatment has any effect on an outcome of interest has been one of the main concerns in economics and statistics. As summarized by Imbens and Wooldridge (2009), the focus of the policy evaluation literature has been mainly confined to identifying and estimating unconditional treatment effect (TE) measures such as the average, distribution and quantile treatment effects. However, one important aspect of policy evaluations is that treatment effects tend to vary across different subpopulations, and focusing on unconditional TE measures can mask important heterogeneity in policy interventions. For instance, a labor market program that does not affect the unemployment duration for the overall population might still be effective for a subgroup of individuals with specific observable characteristics. Assessing if this is the case, or more generally, if there is evidence of TE heterogeneity across observable characteristics is particularly important for researchers and policymakers interested in generalizing some findings across time, places and populations, what the literature calls "external validity"; see e.g. Hotz et al. (2005), Bitler et al. (2006, 2008, 2016), Crump et al. (2008), and Ding et al. (2015). Treatment effect heterogeneity also play an important role in designing statistical treatment rules, see e.g. Manski (2004).

In this article we propose a unified approach to construct tests for different forms of treatment effect heterogeneity, paying particular attention to situations in which the outcome of interest, typically a duration variable, may be subject to right censoring. We develop tests for both average and distributional treatment effects conditional on covariate values. In particular, we consider nonparametric tests to assess whether (a) there is any particular subpopulation defined by covariates for which a policy intervention has a nonzero distribution (or average) effect, and (b) the average treatment effect vary across different subgroups. All proposed tests can be applied under unconfounded treatment assignments, see e.g. Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983), but also when selection into treatment is endogenous and a binary instrumental variable is available to the researcher, see e.g. Imbens and Angrist (1994) and Angrist et al. (1996).

The proposed methodology relies on three main components. First, the tests are based on inverse probability weighted (IPW) estimators, in which the propensity score is estimated by nonparametric methods. We focus on the Series Logit Estimator proposed by Hirano et al. (2003), but alternative estimators are also feasible. Second, since we are interested in TE heterogeneity across subgroups defined by covariates, the tests are based on conditional moment restrictions. To avoid the use of smooth estimates and the "curse of dimensionality", we adopt an integrated moment approach, see e.g. Bierens (1982), Bierens and Ploberger (1997), Stute (1997), and Escanciano (2006). Finally, in order to tackle the potential censoring problem inherited in duration outcomes, we characterize the integrated moments as Kaplan-Meier (KM) integrals, see e.g. Stute and Wang (1993), Stute (1993, 1995, 1996), Chen and Lo (1997), Sellero et al. (2005), and Sant'Anna (2016). It is important to emphasize that such an approach is suitable for both censored and uncensored data.

Combining the aforementioned ingredients, we propose different tests for TE heterogeneity. Our test statistics are suitable functionals of empirical processes whose limiting distribution under the null can be estimated using a multiplicative-type bootstrap. Our proposed tests are of the omnibus type, i.e., they are consistent against any (one and two sided) nonparametric fixed alternative. Furthermore, they can detect nonparametric local alternatives converging to the null at the parametric $n^{-1/2}$-rate, n being the sample size. To the best of our knowledge, no other nonparametric test for TE heterogeneity share these properties, even when censoring is not an issue; see e.g. Crump et al. (2008) and Lee (2009).

This paper is directly connected to the literature on treatment effects with censored data, see e.g. Ham and Lalonde (1996), Baker (1998), Frangakis et al. (1999), Abbring and van den Berg (2003), Frandsen (2015), and Sant'Anna (2016). Nonetheless, the aforementioned papers have focused on unconditional TE measures, and have not devoted attention to nonparametric tests for treatment effect heterogeneity.

The closest papers in terms of focus to the current paper are those by Abadie (2002), Crump et al. (2008), and Lee (2009). In a context without censoring and covariates, Abadie

(2002) propose tests for the null hypotheses of zero distributional (local) treatment effect and first-order stochastic dominance between treatment and control groups when selection into treatment may be endogenous. Our proposal generalize Abadie (2002) by accommodating both covariates (and therefore treatment effect heterogeneity) and randomly censored outcomes. Under unconfounded treatment assignments, Crump et al. (2008) propose smoothed-based tests for the null of hypotheses of zero and constant conditional average treatment effects. Our proposal generalizes Crump et al. (2008) by considering tests for treatment effects heterogeneity beyond the conditional mean, and by allowing endogenous treatment allocations and censored outcomes. Finally, Lee (2009) propose a Mann–Whitney test for the null hypothesis of zero conditional distributional treatment effect (like (a) above) for randomly censored outcomes. Nonetheless, it is not clear how one can generalize Lee (2009) proposal to settings with endogeneity, or how one can use his approach to test other hypotheses related to treatment effect heterogeneity like (b). Such features are in sharp contrast with our proposal.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In order to gain intuition, we first describe the basic setup in which selection into treatment is exogenous, and concentrate on testing the null of zero conditional distributional treatment effect. In Section 3, we derive the asymptotic distribution for the baseline tests and introduce a bootstrap method to approximate their critical values. In Section 4, we present extensions of our basic setup. We consider the null of zero conditional average treatment effect and the null of constant average treatment effect across subpopulations. Furthermore, we show how one can modify the aforementioned tests to accommodate endogenous treatment allocation. A Monte Carlo study in Section 5 investigates the finite sample properties of the tests. In Section 6, we apply the proposed policy evaluation tools to real data. All mathematical proofs are gathered in the Supplementary Appendix. Finally, all tests discussed in this article can be implemented via the open-source R package *kmte,* which is freely available from GitHub (`https://github.com/pedrohcgs/kmte`).

Notation: Let $1\{A\}$ be the indicator function, that is, $1\{A\}$ is equal to one if A is true, and equal to zero otherwise. When A is a vector, such function is taken coordinatewise. For any generic function J, let $J(y-) = \lim_{a \uparrow y} J(a)$, $J\{y\} = J(y) - J(y-)$, and denote the continuous part of $J(\cdot)$ by $J^c(\cdot)$. Let $i = \sqrt{-1}$ be the imaginary number. For random variables $(Y, \mathbf{X})$, $\chi_{Y,X} \equiv \chi_Y \times \chi_X \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ denotes the support of $Y \times \mathbf{X}$, where k is a positive integer. For a set $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \chi_{Y,X}$, let $l^\infty(\mathcal{W})$ be the Banach space of all uniformly bounded real functions on $\mathcal{W}$ equipped with the uniform metric $\|f\|_{\mathcal{W}} \equiv \sup_{z \in \mathcal{W}} |f(z)|$. We will use the notation $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ to denote the supremum norm. The symbol $\Rightarrow$ denotes weak convergence in $(l^\infty(\mathcal{W}), \mathcal{W}_\infty)$ in the sense of J. Hoffmann-Jϕrgensen, where $\mathcal{W}_\infty$ denotes the corresponding Borel σ-algebra, and $\xrightarrow{p}$ denotes convergence in (outer) probability, see e.g. van der Vaart and Wellner (1996). Throughout the paper, all random variables are defined on a common probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$.

2 Testing for zero conditional distributional treatment effect with censored outcomes

2.1 Statistical Framework

We consider a set of individuals flowing into a state of interest, and the time these individuals spend in that state is the outcome of interest, Y. Upon inflow, an individual participates in the program or not, i.e., he/she either receives a treatment or not. Let $Y(0)$ be the potential outcome if no treatment were received, and let $Y(1)$ be the potential outcome if treatment were received. Define D as the treatment indicator, i.e. $D = 1$ if the unit is treated and $D = 0$ otherwise. The realized outcome is $Y = (1-D)Y(0) + DY(1)$. The realized outcome, however, is not always observed, due to censoring mechanism. Let $C(0)$ and $C(1)$ be potential censoring random variables under the control and treatment groups, respectively, and $C = (1-D)C(0) + DC(1)$ be the realized censored variable, beyond which

Y is not observed. For example, C may be the time from treatment assignment until the end of a follow-up. The observed outcome is $Q = (1-D)Q(0) + DQ(1)$, where $Q(d) = \min(Y(d), C(d))$, $d \in \{0,1\}$. On top of Q, the non-censoring indicator $\delta = (1-D)\delta(0) + D\delta(1)$, $\delta(d) = 1\{Y(d) \leq C(d)\}$, $d \in \{0,1\}$, and a vector of pre-treatment variables $\mathbf{X}$ are also observed. We consider $\{(Q_i, \delta_i, D_i, \mathbf{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ as independent and identically distributed (iid) random variables.

Denote the conditional distribution of potential outcomes $Y(0)$ and $Y(1)$ by $F_{Y(0)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x})$ and $F_{Y(1)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x})$, respectively, and let the conditional distributional treatment effect be defined as $\Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x}) \equiv F_{Y(1)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x}) - F_{Y(0)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x})$. To gain intuition, we first focus on testing the hypothesis that the distributional treatment effect (DTE) is equal to zero for every subpopulation defined by covariates, that is,

$$H_0 : \Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x}) = 0 \ \forall (y, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W} \subseteq \chi_{Y,X}. \tag{2.1}$$

Under the null hypothesis H_0, the conditional distribution of Y is not affected by the treatment at $\mathcal{W}$, and the alternative hypothesis H_1 is the negation of H_0.

A crucial step towards testing (2.1) is to show that $\Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x})$ can be identified from the data. To this end, we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 2.1 (i) $(Y(0), Y(1), C(0), C(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp D|\mathbf{X}$ *a.s.*; *and* (ii) *for some* $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon \leq \mathbb{P}(D = 1|\mathbf{X}) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ *a.s.*.;

Assumption 2.2 (i) $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp (C(0), C(1))|D$; *and* (ii) *for* $d \in \{0,1\}$, $\mathbb{P}(\delta(d) = 1|\mathbf{X}, D, Y(d)) = \mathbb{P}(\delta(d) = 1|D, Y(d))$.

We will use the shortcut notation $p_0(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbb{P}(D = 1|\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$, and refer to $p_0(\mathbf{x})$ as the (true) propensity score. Assumptions 2.1 is standard in the treatment effects literature. Assumption 2.1(i) states that, conditional on observables, treatment assignment is independent of potential outcomes and censoring. Assumption 2.1(ii) states that there is overlap in the covariate distributions.

In the absence of censoring, Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) show that Assumptions 2.1 suffices to identify different treatment effect measures, in particular $\Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x})$. Nonetheless, in our setup censoring introduces an additional identification challenge because the probability of being censored is related to potential outcomes, that is, censoring occurs only if $Y(d) > C(d)$, $d \in \{0,1\}$. Ignoring the censoring problem or analyzing only the uncensored outcomes would therefore introduce another source of confounding. To overcome such an issue, Assumption 2.2 imposes additional structure on the censoring mechanism.

Conditions similar to Assumption 2.2 have been used by Stute (1993, 1996), Bang and Tsiatis (2000), Anstrom and Tsiatis (2001), Honore et al. (2002), Lee and Lee (2005), Sellero et al. (2005), Blundell and Powell (2007), Sant'Anna (2016), among others. Assumption 2.2 states that, conditionally on the treatment status, the potential outcomes are independent of the potential censoring random variables, and that, given the underlying potential outcome $Y(d)$, $d \in \{0,1\}$, and the treatment status D, the covariates do not provide any further information whether censoring will take place, that is, $\delta(d)$ and $\mathbf{X}$ are conditionally independent given $Y(d)$, and D. A particular case in which Assumption 2.2 is satisfied is when C is independent of $(Y, \mathbf{X}, D)$, as assumed by Bang and Tsiatis (2000), Anstrom and Tsiatis (2001), Honore et al. (2002), Lee and Lee (2005), Blundell and Powell (2007), among many others. Assumption 2.2 is more general than this particular case: it does not impose any restriction on how Y and C depends on D, and it allows some dependency between C, D and $\mathbf{X}$.

In the following we establish that, given Assumptions 2.1-2.2, a variety of TE measures is identified from $(Q, \delta, D, \mathbf{X})$. In particular, we show that the joint distribution of potential outcome $Y(d)$ and the vector of covariates $\mathbf{X}$, denoted by $F_{Y(d),\mathbf{X}}(y, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(Y(d) \leq y, \mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x})$, $d \in \{0,1\}$ is identified. Once $F_{Y(d),\mathbf{X}}(y, \mathbf{x})$ is identified, $F_{Y(d)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x})$ can be recovered by taking the appropriate Radon-Nikodym derivative.

Let $H_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}(y, \mathbf{x}|d) = \mathbb{P}(Q \leq y, \mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}|D = d)$, $H^1_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}(y, \mathbf{x}|d) = \mathbb{P}(Q \leq y, \mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}, \delta =$

$1|D=d)$ and

$$\Lambda\left(y,\mathbf{x}|d\right)=\int_{0}^{y}\frac{H_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{1}(d\bar{y},\mathbf{x}|d)}{1-H_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}(\bar{y}-,\boldsymbol{\infty}|d))}. \tag{2.2}$$

For $d\in\{0,1\}$, let $\tau_{(d)}:=\min\left(\tau_{Y(d)},\tau_{C(d)}\right)$, where $\tau_{Y(d)}=\inf\left\{y:\mathbb{P}\left(Y\left(d\right)\leq y\right)=1\right\}$, and $\tau_{C(d)}=\inf\left\{y:\mathbb{P}\left(C\left(d\right)\leq y\right)=1\right\}$ are the least upper bound of the support of $Y\left(d\right)$ and $C\left(d\right)$. For simplicity, assume that $\tau_{C(1)}=\tau_{C(0)}=\tau_{C}$, $\tau_{Y(1)}=\tau_{Y(0)}=\tau_{Y}$, implying that $\tau_{(1)}=\tau_{(0)}=\tau$. Finally, for $d\in\{0,1\}$, we denote by $A\left(d\right)$ the (possibly empty) set of atoms of $\mathbb{P}\left(Q\left(d\right)\leq t\right)$.

Lemma 1 *Suppose Assumptions 2.1-2.2 hold. Let $h\left(\cdot\right)$ be any measurable function of $(Y,\mathbf{X},D)$ such that $\mathbb{E}\left[\left|h\left(Y,\mathbf{X},D\right)\right|\right]<\infty$. Then, for $d\in\{0,1\}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}^{km}\left[\frac{1\left\{D=d\right\}h\left(Q,\mathbf{X}\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(D=d|\mathbf{X}\right)}\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[h\left(Y\left(d\right),\mathbf{X}\right)1\left\{Y\left(d\right)<\tau\right\}\right]+1\left\{\tau\in A\left(d\right)\right\}\mathbb{E}\left[h\left(\tau,\mathbf{X}\right)\right], \tag{2.3}$$

where, for any function $g\left(\cdot\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{km}\left[g\left(Q,\mathbf{X},D\right)\right]\equiv&\int g\left(Q,\mathbf{X},1\right)F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}\left(d\bar{y},d\bar{\mathbf{x}}|1\right)\mathbb{P}\left(D=1\right)\\&+\int g\left(Q,\mathbf{X},0\right)F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}\left(d\bar{y},d\bar{\mathbf{x}}|0\right)\mathbb{P}\left(D=0\right),\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

and, for $d\in\{0,1\}$,

$$F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}\left(y,\mathbf{x}|d\right)=1-\exp\left(-\Lambda^{c}\left(y,\mathbf{x}|d\right)\right)\prod_{\bar{y}\leq y}\left[1-\Lambda\left(\left\{\bar{y}\right\},\mathbf{x}|d\right)\right]. \tag{2.5}$$

Moreover, (2.3) also hold conditional on $\mathbf{X}$.

Lemma 1 is based on Sant'Anna (2016), and extends Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) identification results to setups with censored outcomes. It relies on replacing $F_{Y,\mathbf{X}|D}$ by the multivariate Kaplan-Meier $F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}$ in (2.4). Note that $F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}$ only depends on $(Q,\delta,D,\mathbf{X})$, and therefore is self-adjusted to the censoring problem. Furthermore, in the absence of censoring, $F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}=F_{Y,\mathbf{X}|D}$ *a.s.* (Shorack and Wellner, 1986, Proposition 1, pg. 301), implying that, in such case, our identification results reduces to the those of Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983).

It is important to remark that, due to the censoring problem, nonparametric identification of statistical characteristics that depends on the entire support of $Y(d)$ such as $\mathbb{E}[Y(d)]$, $d \in \{0,1\}$, crucially depends on the local structure of the distribution of $Y(d)$ and $C(d)$ at their endpoint; if $\tau_Y < \tau_C$, identification is guaranteed for *any* functional of interest; if $\tau_Y > \tau_C$, only truncated moments can be identified; and if $\tau_C = \tau_Y$, identification is guaranteed unless

$$F_{Y(d),\mathbf{X}}(\{\tau\},\mathbf{x}) > 0 \; and \; \mathbb{P}(C(d) < \tau) = 1. \tag{2.6}$$

In particular, whenever $Y(d)$ is continuous, $\mathbb{E}[h(Y(d),\mathbf{X})]$ is nonparametric identified if $\tau_Y \leq \tau_C$, otherwise one can only identify $\mathbb{E}[h(Y(d),\mathbf{X})1\{Y(d) \leq \tau\}]$. This is intuitive because relevant information about $F_{Y(d),\mathbf{X}}$ on $(\tau_C, \tau_Y]$ will always be cut off due to the censoring. Such information cannot be recovered unless one is willing to rely on additional parametric/shape assumptions. In the rest of the paper, we rule out (2.6).

Remark 1 One should bare in mind that although nonparametric identification of *general* statistical characteristics is not always guaranteed, Lemma 1 is still very powerful. For instance, applying Lemma 1 with $h(Y,\mathbf{X}) = 1\{Y \leq y\}1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}$, we get that $F_{Y(d),\mathbf{X}}(y,\mathbf{x})$ and $F_{Y(d)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x})$ are identified for $(y,\mathbf{x}) \in (-\infty,\tau] \times \chi_X$. This is in sharp contrast with the results of Frangakis et al. (1999), Anstrom and Tsiatis (2001), and Frandsen (2015), who need to restrict the analysis to $y \in (-\infty,\bar{\tau}]$, with $\bar{\tau} < \tau$. In practice, given that there is no general rule on how to appropriately choose $\bar{\tau}$, an ad hoc choice of small $\bar{\tau}$ can lead to undesirable loss of information. The results in Lemma 1 completely avoid such drawback.

2.2 Characterization of the null hypothesis

From Lemma 1, we have that, for $(y,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W} \subseteq (-\infty,\tau] \times \chi_X$, the conditional DTE $\Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x})$ is identified from the data, and therefore we are able to characterize the null hypothesis (2.1) in terms of observables.

One approach to construct tests for (2.1) is to combine Lemma 1 with smoothing tech-

niques, estimate the conditional DTE $\Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x})$, and then compare how close $\Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x})$ is to zero. The main drawback of this strategy is that, when the dimension of covariates $\mathbf{X}$ is moderate as is commonly the case in policy evaluation, tests based on this local approach suffers from the "curse of dimensionality"; see e.g. Fan and Li (1996) for related tests in a different context.

In the next Lemma we show that, by exploiting alternative characterizations of (2.1), one can avoid estimating $\Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x})$, alleviating the drawback associated with local approach described above. To do so, we rely on the "integrated moment approach" used in the goodness-of-fit test literature, see e.g. Bierens (1982), Stute (1997), Escanciano (2006), among others.

Lemma 2 *Suppose Assumptions 2.1-2.2 hold. Assume that the parametric family $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x})$ satisfy Assumption A.1 stated in Appendix A. Then, $\forall (y,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W} \subseteq (-\infty,\tau] \times \chi_X$,*

$$\Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow I_w(y,\mathbf{x}) = 0 \tag{2.7}$$

where $I_w(y,\mathbf{x}) = I_w^1(y,\mathbf{x}) - I_w^0(y,\mathbf{x})$, and for $d \in \{0,1\}$,

$$I_w^d(y,\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbb{E}^{km}\left[\frac{1\{D=d\}\,1\{Q\leq y\}}{\mathbb{P}(D=d|\mathbf{X})} w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x})\right],$$

Lemma 2 adapts Lemma 1 of Escanciano (2006) to the present context. Examples of parametric families $w(\cdot,\mathbf{x})$ such that the equivalence (2.7) holds are the exponential function $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = \exp(i\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{X})$, as in Bierens (1982), and the indicator function $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = 1\{\mathbf{X}\leq\mathbf{x}\}$, as in Stute (1997). Other possible weight functions include $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = \exp(x'X)$, $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = (1+\exp(-\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{X}))^{-1}$, $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = \sin(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{X})$, and $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = \sin(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{X}) + \cos(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{X})$, see Stinchcombe and White (1998).

To avoid cumbersome notation, in the rest of the article we consider $\mathcal{W} = (-\infty,\tau] \times \chi_X$.

2.3 Test statistic

The characterization of the null hypothesis in (2.7) suggests using functionals of an estimator of $I_w(\cdot,\cdot)$ as test statistics. Therefore, we must first estimate $I_w(\cdot,\cdot)$ using the sample $\{(Q_i,\delta_i,D_i,\mathbf{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. From Lemma 1 and the Total Law of Probability, we have that, for $(y,\mathbf{x})\in\mathcal{W}$, $d\in\{0,1\}$,

$$I_w^d(y,\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(D=d)\int \frac{1\{\bar{y}\le y\}\, w(\bar{\mathbf{x}},\mathbf{x})}{\mathbb{P}(D=d|\mathbf{X}=\bar{\mathbf{x}})} F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}(d\bar{y},d\bar{\mathbf{x}}|d). \tag{2.8}$$

Thus, to estimate $I_w(\cdot,\cdot)$, we have to estimate $\mathbb{P}(D=d|\mathbf{X})$, $F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}(y,\mathbf{x}|d)$ and $\mathbb{P}(D=d)$, $d\in\{0,1\}$.

The task of estimating the propensity score $p_0(\cdot)$ is relatively standard. For instance, when the data comes from a randomized experiment, $p_0(\cdot)$ can be estimated by $n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n D_i$. Alternatively, when the treatment allocation depends on observable characteristics, one can nonparametrically estimate $p_0(\cdot)$ using the Series Logit Estimator (SLE) proposed by Hirano et al. (2003). To define the SLE, let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}=(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_r)'$ be a r-dimensional vector of non-negative integers with norm $|\boldsymbol{\lambda}|=\sum_{j=1}^r\lambda_j$. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(l)\}_{l=1}^\infty$ be a sequence including all distinct multi-indices $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ such that $|\boldsymbol{\lambda}(l)|$ is non-decreasing in l and let $\mathbf{x}^\lambda=\prod_{j=1}^r\mathbf{x}_j^{\lambda_j}$. For any integer L, define $\mathbf{R}^L(\mathbf{x})=\left(\mathbf{x}^{\lambda(1)},\ldots,\mathbf{x}^{\lambda(L)}\right)'$ as a vector of power functions. Let $\mathcal{L}(a)=\exp(a)/(1+\exp(a))$ be the logistic CDF. The SLE for $p_0(\mathbf{x})$ is defined as $\hat{p}_n(\mathbf{x})=\mathcal{L}\left(\mathbf{R}^L(x)'\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_L\right)$, where

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_L = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_L}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n D_i\log\left(\mathcal{L}\left(\mathbf{R}^L(\boldsymbol{X}_i)'\boldsymbol{\pi}_L\right)\right)+(1-D_i)\log\left(1-\mathcal{L}\left(\mathbf{R}^L(\boldsymbol{X}_i)'\boldsymbol{\pi}_L\right)\right).$$

We write $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n(D=1|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x})=\hat{p}_n(\mathbf{x})$ and $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n(D=0|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x})=1-\hat{p}_n(\mathbf{x})$.

Next, we move to the most challenging step: estimating $F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}(y,\mathbf{x}|d)$. Note that, due to the binary nature of D, we have to estimate two distribution functions: $F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}(y,\mathbf{x}|1)$, and $F_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}^{km}(y,\mathbf{x}|0)$. To this end, we divide the data $\{(Q_i,\delta_i,D_i,\mathbf{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ into two subsamples given by different values of treatment status D; $\{(Q_i,\delta_i,\mathbf{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$ are those observations with $D_i=1$ ($n_1=\sum_i D_i$); and $\{(Q_i,\delta_i,\mathbf{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_0}$ are those observations with

$D_i = 0\,(n_0 = \sum_i (1 - D_i))$. Then, the task of estimating $F^{km}_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}(y, \mathbf{x}|d)$ is reduced to estimating (2.2) and plugging it into (2.5). We estimate $\Lambda(y, \mathbf{x}|d)$ by replacing $H^1_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}(y, \mathbf{x}|d)$ and $H_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}(y-, \boldsymbol{\infty}|d)$ with their empirical analogues, leading to the estimator

$$\hat{\Lambda}_n(y, \mathbf{x}|d) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_d} \frac{1\{Q_{i:n_d} \leq y\}\, 1\{\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_d]} \leq \mathbf{x}\}\, \delta_{[i:d]}}{n_d - i + 1}, \tag{2.9}$$

where $Q_{1:n_d} \leq \cdots \leq Q_{n_d:n_d}$ are the ordered Q-values in the sub-sample with $\{D = d\}$, and $\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_d]}$ and $\delta_{[i:n_d]}$ are the concomitants of the ith order statistic, that is, the $\mathbf{X}$ and δ paired with $Q_{i:n_d}$. Here, ties within outcomes of interest or censoring random variables are ordered arbitrarily, and ties among Y and C are treated as if the former precedes the latter. By plugging $\hat{\Lambda}_n(y, \mathbf{x}|d)$ into (2.5), and noticing that $\hat{\Lambda}_n(y, \mathbf{x}|d)$ is a step function, we have that a natural estimator for $F^{km}_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D}(y, \mathbf{x}|d)$ is

$$\hat{F}^{km}_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D,n}(y, \mathbf{x}|d) = 1 - \prod_{\bar{y} \leq y} \left[1 - \hat{\Lambda}_n(\{\bar{y}\}, \mathbf{x}|d)\right], \tag{2.10}$$

which is the multivariate extension of the time-honored Kaplan and Meier (1958) product limit estimator proposed by Stute (1993). Since $\hat{F}^{km}_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D,n}(y, \mathbf{x}|d)$ is a step function, it can be seen from (2.9) and (2.10) that

$$\hat{F}^{km}_{Q,\mathbf{X}|D,n}(y, \mathbf{x}|d) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_d} W_{in_d} 1\{Q_{i:n_d} \leq y\}\, 1\{\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_d]} \leq \mathbf{x}\}, \tag{2.11}$$

where, for $1 \leq i \leq n_d$,

$$W_{in_d} = \frac{\delta_{[i:n_d]}}{n_d - i + 1} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \left[\frac{n_d - j}{n_d - j + 1}\right]^{\delta_{[j:n_d]}}$$

is the Kaplan-Meier weight attached to $Q_{i:n_d}$, $d \in \{0, 1\}$.

Finally, given the discrete nature of D, we can nonparametrically estimate $\mathbb{P}(D = d)$ by its relative frequency n_d/n. Putting all these pieces together, we have that

$$\hat{I}_{w,n}(y, \mathbf{x}) = \hat{I}^1_{w,n}(y, \mathbf{x}) - \hat{I}^0_{w,n}(y, \mathbf{x}), \tag{2.12}$$

where, for $d \in \{0,1\}$,

$$\hat{I}^{d}_{w,n}(y,\mathbf{x}) = \frac{n_d}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n_d} W_{in_d}\frac{1\{Q_{i:n_d} \leq y\}\, w\left(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_d]},\mathbf{x}\right)}{\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n\left(D=d|\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_d]}\right)}. \tag{2.13}$$

In the absence of censoring, $W_{in_d} = n_d^{-1}$ $a.s.$, and (2.13) is reduced to the empirical analogue of (2.8). Thus, it is evident that our proposal is suitable for both censored and not censored outcomes.

With $\hat{I}_{w,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$ at hands, testing the null hypothesis (2.1) is relatively straightforward: for a given weighting function $w(\cdot,\mathbf{x})$, we just need to compare how close $\sqrt{n}\hat{I}_{w,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$ is to zero. We consider the usual *sup* and L_2 norms, with the indicator weighting function $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = 1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}$, leading to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS), and Cramér-von Mises (CvM) test statistics

$$KS_n = \sqrt{n}\sup_{(y,\mathbf{x})\in\mathcal{W}}\left|\hat{I}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x})\right|, \tag{2.14}$$

$$CvM_n = n\int_{\mathcal{W}}\left|\hat{I}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x})\right|^2 \hat{H}_n(dy,d\mathbf{x}), \tag{2.15}$$

respectively, where $\hat{I}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$ is defined as $\hat{I}_{w,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$ with $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = 1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}$, and $\hat{H}_n(y,\mathbf{x})$ denotes the sample analog of $H(y,\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(Q \leq y, \mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x})$. Obviously, different test statistics could be developed by applying other distances, or choosing alternative weighting functions w, but for ease of exposition, we concentrate of KS_n and CvM_n.

Remark 2 In some circumstance, researchers may be interested in assessing if the DTE is equal to zero for every subpopulation defined by particular component(s) of $\mathbf{X}$. In this situation, instead of testing for (2.1), the goal would be testing the null

$$H_0^{sub}: F_{Y(1)|\mathbf{X}_1}(y|\mathbf{x}_1) - F_{Y(0)|\mathbf{X}_1}(y|\mathbf{x}_1) = 0 \ \forall (y,\mathbf{x}_1) \in \mathcal{W},$$

where $\mathbf{X}_1$ is a subset of component(s) of $\mathbf{X}$. Note that by setting $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = 1(\mathbf{X}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_1)$, or more generally, $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = w(\mathbf{X}_1,\mathbf{x}_1)$, our tests can cover this type of hypothesis in a rather straightforward manner.

3 Asymptotic Theory

3.1 Asymptotic linear representation

We now discuss the asymptotic theory for our test statistics using the following notation. For $d \in \{0,1\}$, let $H_d(y) = \mathbb{P}(Q \leq y, D = d)$, $H_{d,0}(y) = \mathbb{P}(Q \leq y, \delta = 0, D = d)$, and $H_{d,11}(y,x) = \mathbb{P}(Q \leq y, \mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}, \delta = 1, D = d)$. Define

$$\gamma_{d,0}(\bar{y}) = \exp\left\{\int_0^{\bar{y}-} \frac{H_{d,0}(d\bar{w})}{1 - H_d(\bar{w})}\right\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Let

$$\gamma_{d,1}(\bar{y}; y, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{1 - H_d(\bar{y})} \int 1\{\bar{y} < \bar{w}\}\, \xi_d(\bar{w}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, d; y, \mathbf{x})\, \gamma_{d,0}(\bar{w})\, H_{d,11}(d\bar{w}, d\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\gamma_{d,2}(\bar{y}; y, \mathbf{x}) = \int\int \frac{1\{\bar{v} < \bar{y}, \bar{v} < \bar{w}\}\, \xi_d(\bar{w}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}, d; y, \mathbf{x})}{[1 - H_d(\bar{v})]^2} \gamma_{d,0}(\bar{w})\, H_{d,0}(d\bar{v})\, H_{d,11}(d\bar{w}, d\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$\xi_1(Q, \mathbf{X}, D; y, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{D1\{Q \leq y\}\, 1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}}{p_0(\mathbf{X})}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\xi_0(Q, \mathbf{X}, D; y, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{(1 - D)\, 1\{Q \leq y\}\, 1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}}{1 - p_0(\mathbf{X})}. \tag{3.5}$$

Put

$$\eta_{d,i}(y, \mathbf{x}) = \xi_d(Q_i, \mathbf{X}_i, D_i; y, \mathbf{x})\, \gamma_{d,0}(Q_i)\, \delta_i + \gamma_{d,1}(Q_i; y, \mathbf{x})(1 - \delta_i) - \gamma_{d,2}(Q_i; y, \mathbf{x}). \tag{3.6}$$

Some remarks are necessary. First, the above representation relies only on the "known" functions ξ_d, $d \in \{0,1\}$. Then, as discussed in Stute (1995, 1996), the first term of $\eta_{d,i}(y, \mathbf{x})$ has expectation $\mathbb{E}[\xi_d(Q, \mathbf{X}, D; y, \mathbf{x})]$. The second and third terms have identical expectations, and appear due to the censoring. As it is expected and desired, in the absence of censoring, $\gamma_{d,0}(\cdot) = 1$ *a.s.*, and $\gamma_{d,1}(\cdot) = \gamma_{d,2}(\cdot) = 0$ *a.s.*.

Given that $\hat{I}_{1,n}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the difference of two empirical KM integrals, define

$$\eta_i(y,\mathbf{x}) = \eta_{1,i}(y,\mathbf{x}) - \eta_{0,i}(y,\mathbf{x}), \tag{3.7}$$

the difference of (3.6) between the treated and control group.

To discuss the estimation effect coming from not knowing $p_0(\cdot)$ in the KM-integrals, let

$$\alpha_1(\mathbf{X};y,\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{F_{Y(1)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{X})\,1\{\mathbf{X}\le\mathbf{x}\}}{p_0(\mathbf{X})},\ \alpha_0(\mathbf{X};y,\mathbf{x}) = \frac{F_{Y(0)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{X})\,1\{\mathbf{X}\le\mathbf{x}\}}{1-p_0(\mathbf{X})} \tag{3.8}$$

Notice that $\alpha_1(\cdot;y,\mathbf{x})$ and $\alpha_0(\cdot;y,\mathbf{x})$ are nothing more than the conditional expectation of the derivative of (3.4) and (3.5) with respect to $p_0(\cdot)$, respectively. Similarly to (3.7), define

$$\alpha(\mathbf{X};y,\mathbf{x}) = \alpha_1(\mathbf{X};y,x) - \alpha_0(\mathbf{X};y,\mathbf{x}). \tag{3.9}$$

In order to present our asymptotic results, we need to assume some additional regularity conditions related to the estimation of the propensity score $p_0(\cdot)$, and some integrability conditions to guarantee that the variance of our test statistics is finite and that the censoring effects do not dominate in the right tails. These technical assumptions are stated in the Appendix.

Lemma 3 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.2,and Assumptions A.2-A.6 stated in Appendix A, we have*

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{I}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x}) - I_1(y,\mathbf{x})\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\{[\eta_i(y,\mathbf{x}) - I_1(y,\mathbf{x})] + \alpha(\mathbf{X}_i;y,\mathbf{x})(D_i - p_0(\mathbf{X}_i))\}$$

uniformly in $(y,\mathbf{x})\in\mathcal{W}$.

3.2 Asymptotic null distribution

Using the uniform representation from Lemma 3, we next establish the weak convergence of the processes $\sqrt{n}\hat{I}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$ under the null hypothesis (2.1).

Theorem 1 *Under the null hypothesis (2.1), Assumptions 2.1-2.2,and Assumptions A.2-*

A.6 stated in Appendix A, we have

$$\sqrt{n}\hat{I}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x}) \Rightarrow C_{\infty},$$

where C_{∞} *is Gaussian process with zero mean and covariance function*

$$V\left((y_1,\mathbf{x}_1),(y_2,\mathbf{x}_2)\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\psi(y_1,\mathbf{x}_1)\,\psi(y_2,\mathbf{x}_2)\right], \tag{3.10}$$

with $\psi(y,\mathbf{x}) = \eta(y,\mathbf{x}) + \alpha(\mathbf{X};y,\mathbf{x})(D - p(\mathbf{X}))$.

Now, we can apply the continuous mapping theorem to characterize the limiting null distribution of our test statistics using the sup and L_2 distances.

Corollary 1 *Under the null hypothesis (2.1) and the Assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$KS_n \xrightarrow{d} \sup_{(t,\mathbf{x})\in\mathcal{W}} |C_{\infty}(y,\mathbf{x})|,$$
$$CvM_n \xrightarrow{d} \int_{\mathcal{W}} |C_{\infty}(y,\mathbf{x})|^2 H(dy,d\mathbf{x}).$$

Let T_n be a generic notation for KS_n and CvM_n. From Corollary 1, it follows immediately that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{T_n > c_{\alpha}^{T}\right\} = \alpha$$

where $c_{\alpha}^{T} = \inf\{c \in [0,\infty) : \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\{T_n > c\} = \alpha\}$.

3.3 Asymptotic power against fixed and local alternatives

Now we analyze the asymptotic properties of our tests under the fixed alternative H_1. Under H_1, there is at least one $(y,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $\Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$, implying that $I_1(y,\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ for some $(y,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W}$. Therefore, our test statistics KS_n and CvM_n diverge to infinity. Given that the critical values are bounded, it follows that our tests are consistent. We formalize this result in the next theorem.

Theorem 2 *Under the alternative hypothesis H_1, and the Assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{KS_n > c_\alpha^{KS}\right\} = 1,$$
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{CvM_n > c_\alpha^{CvM}\right\} = 1.$$

Given that our test statistics diverge to infinity under fixed alternatives, it is desirable studying the asymptotic power of these tests under local alternatives. To this end, we study the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{I}_{1,n}(y, \mathbf{x})$ under alternative hypotheses converging to the null at the parametric rate $n^{-1/2}$.

Consider the following class of local alternatives:

$$H_{1,n} : \Upsilon(y|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{h(y, \mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{n}} \quad \forall (y, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W}. \tag{3.11}$$

In the sequel, we need that (3.11) satisfies the following regularity condition.

Assumption 3.1 *(a) $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ is an F-integrable function;*

(b) the set $h_n \equiv \left[(y, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W} : n^{-1/2} h(y, \mathbf{x}) \neq 0\right]$ has positive Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 3 *Under the local alternatives (3.11), Assumptions 2.1-2.2, 3.1, and Assumptions A.2-A.6 stated in Appendix A,*

$$\sqrt{n}\hat{I}_{1,n}(y, \mathbf{x}) \Rightarrow C_\infty + R$$

where C_∞ is the process defined in Theorem 1 and $R(y, \mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbb{E}\left[h(y, \mathbf{X}) 1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}\right]$.

From the above Theorem and straightforward application of the continuous mapping theorem, we see that our test statistics, under local alternatives of the form of (3.11), converge to a different distribution due to the presence of a deterministic shift function R. This additional term guarantees the good local power property of our tests.

3.4 Estimation of critical values

From the above theorems, we see that the asymptotic distribution of $\sqrt{n}\hat{I}_{1,n}(\cdot,\cdot)$ depends on the underlying data generating process and standardization is complicated. To overcome this problem, we propose to compute critical values with the assistance of a multiplier bootstrap. The proposed procedure has good theoretical and empirical properties, is straightforward to verify its asymptotic validity, is computationally easy to implement, and do not require computing new parameter estimates at each bootstrap replication.

In order to implement the bootstrap, we need nonparametric estimators for all the terms in the asymptotic linear representation of Lemma 3, namely the propensity score $p_0(\cdot)$, $\eta(y,\mathbf{x})$ as in (3.7), and $\alpha(\cdot;y,\mathbf{x})$ as in (3.9).

As already discussed, we estimate $p_0(\cdot)$ using the SLE of Hirano et al. (2003). In order to estimate $\eta(y,\mathbf{x})$, we notice that after plugging in $\hat{p}_n(\cdot)$, each γ only depends on H-functions, and is therefore estimable by just replacing the H-terms by their empirical counterparts. Then, we estimate $\eta(y,\mathbf{x})$ by its empirical analogue,

$$\hat{\eta}_n(y,\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\eta}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x}) - \hat{\eta}_{0,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$$

where, for $d \in \{0,1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\eta}_{d,n}(y,\mathbf{x}) &= \hat{\xi}_{d,n}(Q,\mathbf{X},D;y,\mathbf{x})\,\hat{\gamma}_{d,0,n}(Q)\,\delta_d + \hat{\gamma}_{d,1,n}(Q)(1-\delta) - \hat{\gamma}_{d,2,n}(Q), \\
\hat{\gamma}_{d,0,n}(\bar{y}) &= \exp\left\{\int_0^{\bar{y}-} \frac{\hat{H}_{d,0,n}(d\bar{w})}{1-\hat{H}_{d,n}(\bar{w})}\right\}, \\
\hat{\gamma}_{d,1,n}(\bar{y}) &= \frac{1}{1-\hat{H}_{d,n}(\bar{y})}\int 1\{\bar{y}<\bar{w}\}\,\hat{\xi}_{d,n}(\bar{w},\bar{\mathbf{x}},d;y,\mathbf{x})\,\hat{\gamma}_{d,0,n}(\bar{w})\,\hat{H}_{d,11,n}(d\bar{w},d\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \\
\hat{\gamma}_{d,2,n}(\bar{y}) &= \int\int \frac{1\{\bar{v}<\bar{y},\bar{v}<\bar{w}\}\,\hat{\xi}_{d,n}(\bar{w},\bar{\mathbf{x}},d;y,\mathbf{x})}{\left[1-\hat{H}_{d,n}(\bar{v})\right]^2}\hat{\gamma}_{d,0,n}(\bar{w})\,\hat{H}_{d,0,n}(d\bar{v})\,\hat{H}_{d,11,n}(d\bar{w},d\bar{\mathbf{x}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\xi}_{1,n}(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot;y,\mathbf{x})$ and $\hat{\xi}_{0,n}(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot;y,\mathbf{x})$ are defined as in (3.4) and (3.5), respectively, but

with the true propensity score $p_0(\cdot)$ replaced by its SLE $\hat{p}_n(\cdot)$, and

$$\hat{H}_{d,n}(\bar{w}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} 1\{Q_i \leq \bar{w}\} 1\{D_i = d\},$$

$$\hat{H}_{d,0,n}(\bar{w}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} (1-\delta_i) 1\{Q_i \leq \bar{w}\} 1\{D_i = d\},$$

$$\hat{H}_{d,11,n}(\bar{w}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i 1\{Q_i \leq \bar{w}\} 1\{\mathbf{X}_i \leq \bar{\mathbf{x}}\} 1\{D_i = d\},$$

are the sample counterparts of $H_d(\bar{w})$, $H_{d,0}(\bar{w})$ and $H_{d,11}(\bar{w}, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$, respectively.

Finally, we must consider nonparametric estimators for $\alpha(\cdot; y, \mathbf{x}) = \alpha_1(\cdot; y, \mathbf{x}) - \alpha_0(\cdot; y, \mathbf{x})$, $\alpha_1(\cdot; y, \mathbf{x})$ and $\alpha_1(\cdot; y, \mathbf{x})$ being defined in (3.8). To this end, we must estimate $F_{Y(0)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x})$ and $F_{Y(1)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x})$. In the absence of censored data, Donald and Hsu (2014) propose to estimate these functionals using nonparametric series regression. Given that the outcome of interest Y is subjected to censoring, such procedure is not at our disposal. Notwithstanding, by using the Kaplan-Meier weights as discussed in Sections 2 and 3.1, we can overcome such problem and estimate $F_{Y(0)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x})$ and $F_{Y(1)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x})$ by the Kaplan-Meier series estimators:

$$\hat{F}^{km}_{Y(0)|\mathbf{X},n}(y|\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{n_0}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n_0} W_{in_0} \frac{1\{Q_{[i:n_0]} \leq y\}}{1-\hat{p}_n(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_0]})} \mathbf{R}^L(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_0]})\right)' \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{R}^L(\mathbf{X}_i)\mathbf{R}^L(\mathbf{X}_i)'\right)^{-1} \mathbf{R}^L(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$\hat{F}^{km}_{Y(1)|\mathbf{X},n}(y|\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{n_1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} W_{in_1} \frac{1\{Q_{[i:n_1]} \leq y\}}{\hat{p}_n(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_1]})} \mathbf{R}^L(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_1]})\right)' \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{R}^L(\mathbf{X}_i)\mathbf{R}^L(\mathbf{X}_i)'\right)^{-1} \mathbf{R}^L(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3.13)$$

where $\mathbf{R}^L(\cdot)$ is the same power series used in SLE estimator, with potentially different number of series. Armed with (3.12) and (3.13), we can estimate $\alpha(\cdot; y, \mathbf{x})$ by

$$\hat{\alpha}^{km}_n(\mathbf{X}; y, \mathbf{x}) = -\left(\frac{\hat{F}^{km}_{Y(1)|\mathbf{X},n}(y|\mathbf{X})}{\hat{p}_n(\mathbf{X})} + \frac{\hat{F}^{km}_{Y(0)|X,n}(y|\mathbf{X})}{1-\hat{p}_n(\mathbf{X})}\right) 1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}.$$

Once we have nonparametric estimators for $p_0(\cdot)$, $\eta(y,\mathbf{x})$, and $\alpha(\cdot;y,\mathbf{x})$, the bootstrapped version of $\hat{I}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$ is given by

$$\hat{I}^*_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\hat{\eta}_{i,n}(y,\mathbf{x}) + \hat{\alpha}_n^{KM}(\mathbf{X}_i;y,\mathbf{x})(D_i - \hat{p}_n(\mathbf{X}_i))\right]V_i$$

where $\hat{\eta}_n(y,\mathbf{x}) = \hat{\eta}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x}) - \hat{\eta}_{0,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$, and the random variables $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are *iid* with bounded support, zero mean and variance one, being independent generated from the sample $\{(Q_i,\delta_i,D_i,\mathbf{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. A popular example involves *iid* Bernoulli variables $\{V_i\}$ with $\mathbb{P}(V = 1-\kappa) = \kappa/\sqrt{5}$ and $\mathbb{P}(V=\kappa) = 1-\kappa/\sqrt{5}$, where $\kappa = \left(\sqrt{5}+1\right)/2$, as suggested by Mammen (1993). Alternatively, one can use Rademacher random variables.

Replacing $\hat{I}_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$ with $\hat{I}^*_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x})$, we get the bootstrap versions of KS_n and CvM_n, KS_n^* and CvM_n^*, respectively. The asymptotic critical values are estimated by

$$c_{n,\alpha}^{KS,\,*} \equiv \inf\left\{c_\alpha \in [0,\infty) : \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_n^*\{KS_n^* > c_\alpha\} = \alpha\right\},$$
$$c_{n,\alpha}^{CvM,\,*} \equiv \inf\left\{c_\alpha \in [0,\infty) : \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_n^*\{CvM_n^* > c_\alpha\} = \alpha\right\}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_n^*$ means bootstrap probability, i.e. conditional on the sample $\{(Q_i,\delta_i,D_i,\mathbf{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. In practice, $c_{n,\alpha}^{KS,\,*}$ and $c_{n,\alpha}^{CvM,\,*}$ are approximated as accurately as desired by $\left(KS_n^*\right)_{B(1-\alpha)}$ and $\left(CvM_n^*\right)_{B(1-\alpha)}$, the $B(1-\alpha)-th$ order statistic from B replicates $\left\{KS_n^*\right\}_{l=1}^B$ of KS_n^* or $\left\{CvM_n^*\right\}_{l=1}^B$ of CvM_n^*, respectively.

The next theorem establishes the asymptotic validity of the multiplier bootstrap procedure proposed above.

Theorem 4 *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, and Assumptions A.2-A.6 stated in Appendix A hold. Assume $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are iid, independent of the sample $\{(Q_i,\delta_i,D_i,\mathbf{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, bounded random variables with zero mean and variance one. Then, under the null hypothesis (2.1), any fixed alternative hypothesis, or under the local alternatives (3.11)*

$$\sqrt{n}\hat{I}^*_{1,n}(y,\mathbf{x}) \underset{*}{\Rightarrow} C_\infty$$

where C_∞ is the same Gaussian process of Theorem 1 and $\underset{*}{\Rightarrow}$ denoting weak convergence in

probability under the the bootstrap law (see Giné and Zinn (1990)).

4 Some applications of the basic setup

4.1 Testing for Zero Conditional Average Treatment Effect

So far, we have only discussed tests for the existence of distributional treatment effects. Although the proposed tests for zero conditional distributional treatment effect are able to detect a very broad set of alternative hypotheses, they are still not able to pin down the direction of the departure from the null. For instance, if we reject the null (2.1), we unfortunately do not know if the policy affects the conditional mean or, instead, any other particular feature of the outcome distribution (e.g. its 5th moment). Being able to differentiate such cases is important: policy makers may be in favor of implementing a job training that reduces the average unemployment durations, but may be more reluctant to implement such policy if there is evidence that it affects only the other higher order moments. Given the major role played by the average treatment effect, in this section we show how to adapt our DTE tests to focus on this particular TE measure.

Let $\Upsilon^{cate}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbb{E}[Y(1)|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}] - \mathbb{E}[Y(0)|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}]$ be the conditional average treatment effect. From Lemma 1, we have that identification of $\Upsilon^{cate}(\mathbf{x})$ is not guaranteed unless the support of the censoring variable is larger than or equal to the support the potential outcome of interest. Given that in follow-up studies such condition is usually violated, it may be more appropriate to focus on the restricted conditional average treatment effect (CATE),

$$\Upsilon^{cate}_{\bar{\tau}}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbb{E}[Y(1)1\{Y(1)\leq\bar{\tau}\}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}] - \mathbb{E}[Y(0)1\{Y(0)\leq\bar{\tau}\}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}],$$

see e.g. Zucker (1998), and Barker (2009). From Lemma 1 we know that $\Upsilon^{cate}_{\bar{\tau}}(\mathbf{x})$ is nonparametrically identified for all $\bar{\tau} \leq \tau$.

We are concerned with the following hypothesis:

$$H_0^{cate} : \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}^{cate}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W}_X \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathcal{W}_X \subseteq \chi_X$. Under H_0^{cate}, the restricted average treatment effect (ATE) is equal to zero for all subpopulations defined by covariates. The alternative hypothesis H_1^{cate} is the negation of the null H_0^{cate}.

From the same reasoning of Lemma 2, we have that

$$\Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}^{cate}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W}_X \Leftrightarrow I_{\bar{\tau}}^{cate}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W}_X,$$

where $I_{\bar{\tau}}^{cate}(\mathbf{x}) = I_{\bar{\tau}}^{1,cate}(\mathbf{x}) - I_{\bar{\tau}}^{0}(\mathbf{x})$, with

$$I_{\bar{\tau}}^{d,cate}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbb{E}^{km}\left[\frac{1\{D=d\}\,Q1\{Q \leq \bar{\tau}\}}{\mathbb{P}(D=d|\mathbf{X})} 1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}\right], \ d \in \{0,1\}.$$

Then, following the same steps as in Section 2.3, our KS type test statistic for hypothesis (4.1) is

$$KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W}_X} \left|\sqrt{n}\hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate}(\mathbf{x})\right|,$$

where $\hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate}(y,\mathbf{x}) = \hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{1,cate}(x) - \hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{0}(\mathbf{x})$, with

$$\hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{d,cate}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_d} W_{in_d} \frac{Q_{i:n_d} 1\{Q_{i:n_d} \leq \bar{\tau}\} 1\left(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_d]} \leq \mathbf{x}\right)}{\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n\left(D=d|\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_d]}\right)}, \ d \in \{0,1\}.$$

The discussion for the CvM test is the same and is therefore omitted. Notice that when $\bar{\tau} = \tau$, $1\{Q \leq \tau\} = 1$, and therefore no user-chosen trimming is necessary. This is of particular importance because, in this case, we are using all the information about the average treatment effect available in the data.

Under similar conditions to those in Section 3, we can derive the asymptotic linear representation of $\sqrt{n}\hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate}(\mathbf{x})$. Using an analogous procedure to the one described in Section 3.4, let $c_{\bar{\tau},\alpha,n}^{cate,*}$ denote the bootstrap critical value of the $KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate}$. In the next theorem, we establish that KS_n^{cate} shares the same attractive features of KS_n.

Theorem 5 *Suppose Assumptions 2.1-2.2, and Assumptions A.2, A.4, A.5, A.7 and A.8 stated in Appendix A are satisfied. Then, for a fixed* $\bar{\tau} \leq \tau$,

1. *Under* H_0^{cate}, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate} > c_{\bar{\tau},\alpha,n}^{cate,*} \right\} = \alpha$.

2. *Under* H_1^{cate}, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate} > c_{\bar{\tau},\alpha,n}^{cate,*} \right\} = 1$.

3. *Under* $H_{1,n}^{cate} : \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}^{cate}(\mathbf{x}) = n^{-1/2} h_{\bar{\tau}}^{cate}(\mathbf{x}) \ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W}_X$, *if if* $h_{\bar{\tau}}^{cate}(\cdot)$ *is an integrable function, and the set* $h_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate} \equiv \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W}_X : n^{-1/2} h_{\bar{\tau}}^{cate}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0 \right\}$ *has positive Lebesgue measure, then* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate} > c_{\bar{\tau},\alpha,n}^{cate,*} \right\} > \alpha$.

The results in Theorem 5 are related to Crump et al. (2008). In the absence of censoring, Crump et al. (2008) propose a test for H_0^{cate} based on smooth estimates of the conditional average treatment effect. In particular, they use a series approach to estimate $\mathbb{E}[Y(1)|\mathbf{X}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y(0)|\mathbf{X}]$, and then compare how close the smooth estimate of $\Upsilon^{cate}(\cdot)$ is from zero. Given that Crump et al. (2008) test is based on the "local approach", their test for H_0^{cate} is not able to detect local alternatives of the type of $H_{1,n}^{cate}$, and may suffer from the "curse of dimensionality". This is in sharp contrast with the results in Theorem 5. Thus, one can see that even when censoring is not an issue, our $KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{cate}$ test can uncover TE heterogeneity that Crump et al. (2008) would miss, highlighting the attractive properties of our test.

4.2 Testing for Homogeneous Conditional Average Treatment Effect

In this section we show how one can adapt our baseline framework to test whether there is heterogeneity in the (restricted) ATE with respect to observed characteristics. In simple terms, we want to assess whether individuals with different background characteristics have different ATE. Such hypothesis is particularly relevant for policy makers interested in extending a pilot program to a larger population; if there is strong evidence against the hypothesis

of homogeneous effect, one may be more concerned in targeting the appropriate population who should receive the treatment, see e.g. Manski (2004) and Crump et al. (2008).

As in Section 4.1, we focus on the restricted CATE. We seek to test

$$H_0^{\text{hom}} : \exists\ \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}} \in \mathbb{R} : \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}^{cate}(\mathbf{x}) = \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}\ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \chi_X. \tag{4.2}$$

The alternative hypothesis H_1^{hom} is the negation of H_0^{hom}.

As before, one can show that the null hypothesis (4.2) is true if and only if

$$I_{\bar{\tau}}^{\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0\ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \chi_X$$

where $I_{\bar{\tau}}^{\text{hom}}(y, \mathbf{x}) = I_{\bar{\tau}}^{1,\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x}) - I_{\bar{\tau}}^{0,\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x})$,

$$I_{\bar{\tau}}^{d,\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbb{E}^{km}\left[1\{D=d\}\left(\frac{Q1\{Q \le \bar{\tau}\}}{\mathbb{P}(D=d|\mathbf{X})} - (2D-1)\, I_{\bar{\tau}}^{ate}\right) 1\{\mathbf{X} \le \mathbf{x}\}\right],$$

$d \in \{0,1\}$, and $I_{\bar{\tau}}^{ate}$ is the restricted average treatment effect,

$$I_{\bar{\tau}}^{ate} \equiv \mathbb{E}^{km}\left[\frac{DQ1\{Q \le \bar{\tau}\}}{\mathbb{P}(D=1|\mathbf{X})}\right] - \mathbb{E}^{km}\left[\frac{(1-D)\,Q1\{Q \le \bar{\tau}\}}{\mathbb{P}(D=0|\mathbf{X})}\right].$$

Based on this characterization of H_0^{hom}, our propose test statistic for (4.2) is

$$KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{\text{hom}} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W}_X} \left|\sqrt{n}\hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x})\right|,$$

where $\hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{1,\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{0,\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x})$,

$$\hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{ate} = \frac{n_1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} W_{in_1}\frac{Q_{i:n_1}1\{Q_{i:n_1} \le \bar{\tau}\}}{\hat{p}_n\left(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_1]}\right)} - \frac{n_0}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n_0} W_{jn_0}\frac{Q_{j:n_0}1\{Q_{j:n_0} \le \bar{\tau}\}}{1-\hat{p}_n\left(\mathbf{X}_{[j:n_0]}\right)},$$

$\hat{p}_n(\cdot)$ is the SLE for $p_0(\cdot)$, and, for $d \in \{0,1\}$,

$$\hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{d,\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{n_d}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n_d} W_{in_d}\left(\frac{Q_{i:n_d}1\{Q_{i:n_d} \le \bar{\tau}\}}{\hat{\mathbb{P}}_n\left(D=d|\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_d]}\right)} - (2d-1)\,\hat{I}_{\bar{\tau},n}^{ate}\right) 1\left(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_d]} \le \mathbf{x}\right).$$

Let $c_{\bar{\tau},\alpha,n}^{\text{hom},*}$ denote the bootstrap critical value of the $KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{\text{hom}}$. Next theorem establishes the asymptotic properties of KS_n^{hom}.

Theorem 6 *Suppose Assumptions 2.1-2.2, and Assumptions A.2, A.4, A.5, A.7 and A.8*

stated in Appendix A are satisfied. Then, for a fixed $\bar{\tau} \leq \tau$,

1. *Under* H_0^{hom}, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{\text{hom}} > c_{\bar{\tau},\alpha,n}^{\text{hom},*} \right\} = \alpha$.

2. *Under* H_1^{hom}, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{\text{hom}} > c_{\bar{\tau},\alpha,n}^{\text{hom},*} \right\} = 1$.

3. *Under* $H_{1,n}^{\text{hom}} : \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}(\mathbf{x}) - \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}} = n^{-1/2} h_{\bar{\tau}}^{\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x})$ $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \chi_X$, *if* $h_{\bar{\tau}}^{\text{hom}}(\cdot)$ *is an integrable function, and the set* $h_{\bar{\tau},n}^{\text{hom}} \equiv \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \chi_X : n^{-1/2} h_{\bar{\tau}}^{\text{hom}}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0 \right\}$ *has positive Lebesgue measure, then* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ KS_{\bar{\tau},n}^{\text{hom}} > c_{\bar{\tau},\alpha,n}^{\text{hom},*} \right\} > \alpha$.

The results in Theorem 6 are related to Crump et al. (2008), who also proposed a test for H_0^{hom} in a context in which censoring is not present. As in the case of Theorem 5, Crump et al. (2008) test is not able to detect local alternatives of the type of $H_{1,n}^{\text{hom}}$. Furthermore, Crump et al. (2008) proposal is also not suitable to assess the existent of ATE heterogeneity when the conditioning vector in (4.2) is $\mathbf{X}_1 \subset \mathbf{X}$. As discussed in Remark 2, our test easily accommodates this situation. Given these attractive features, we argue that, even when censoring is not an issue, the results in Theorem 6 can be of substantial interest for applied researchers and policy makers.

4.3 Testing within the Local Treatment Effect setup

In many important applications, the assumption that treatment allocation is exogenous may be too restrictive. For instance, when individuals do not comply with their treatment assignment, or more general, when they sort into treatment based on expected gains, Assumption 2.1 is likely to be violated. The goal of this section is to show that, if the unconfoundedness assumption does not hold, our tests are still applicable to the local treatment effect (LTE) setup introduced by Imbens and Angrist (1994) and Angrist et al. (1996).

The LTE setup presumes the availability of a binary instrumental variable Z for the treatment assignment. Denote $D(0)$ and $D(1)$ the value that D would have taken if Z is equal to zero or one, respectively. The realized treatment is $D = ZD(1) + (1 - Z) D(0)$ .Thus, the observed sample consist of *iid* copies $\{(Q_i, \delta_i, D_i, Z_i, \mathbf{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. Denote $q_0(\mathbf{X}) \equiv \mathbb{P}(Z = 1|\mathbf{X})$.

In order to identify the LTE for the subpopulation of compliers, that is, individuals who comply with their actual assignment of treatment and would have complied with the alternative assignment, we need the following assumptions.

Assumption 4.1 *(i)* $(Y(0), Y(1), D(0), D(1), C(0), C(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z|\mathbf{X}$*; (ii) for some* $\varepsilon > 0$*,* $\varepsilon \leq q_0(\mathbf{X}) \leq 1-\varepsilon$ *a.s. and* $\mathbb{P}(D(1) = 1|\mathbf{X}) > \mathbb{P}(D(0) = 1|\mathbf{X})$ *a.s.; and (iii)* $\mathbb{P}(D(1) > D(0)|\mathbf{X}) = 1$ *a.s.*.

Assumption 4.2 *Assume that (i)* $(Y(0), Y(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp (C(0), C(1))|D, Z$*; and (ii) for* $d \in \{0, 1\}$*,* $\mathbb{P}(\delta(d) = 1|\mathbf{X}, D, Z, Y(d)) = \mathbb{P}(\delta(d) = 1|D, Z, Y(d))$.

Assumption 4.1 is standard in the literature, see e.g. Abadie (2003). Assumption 4.2 is analogous to Assumption 2.2, and is necessary due to the censoring. It is important to notice that Assumption 4.2 does not restrict how treatment status and instruments affects the censoring variable, which is weaker than typical assumptions used in the literature, see e.g. Frandsen (2015).

Because treatment effects are allowed to be arbitrarily heterogeneous, one is only able to identify effects for the complier subpopulation, see e.g. Abadie (2003), Frandsen (2015) and Sant'Anna (2016). Let $\Upsilon^{ldte}(y|\mathbf{x}) \equiv F_{Y(1)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x}, pop = comp) - F_{Y(0)|\mathbf{X}}(y|\mathbf{x}, pop = comp)$. Thus, our goal is to test the null hypothesis

$$H_0^{ldte} : \Upsilon^{ldte}(y|\mathbf{x}) = 0 \ \forall (y, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W}, \tag{4.3}$$

against H_1^{ldte}, which is simply the negation of (4.3). The null (4.3) is analogous to (2.1) within the LTE setup. For conciseness, we concentrate our attention on H_0^{ldte}, but of course, we can also adapt the hypotheses discussed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 to the LTE setup in a routine fashion. Such extensions are presented in Supplementary Appendix.

In order to proceed, we must show that $\Upsilon^{ldte}(y|\mathbf{x})$ can be written in terms of observables $(Q, \delta, D, Z, \mathbf{X})$. In the Supplementary Appendix we show that this is the case by extend Lemma 1 to the LTE setup. Then, using the integrated moment approach analogous to

Lemma 2, we can show that H_0^{ldte} is true if and only if

$$I^{ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) = 0 \ \forall (y,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W},$$

where $I^{ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) = I^{1,ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) - I^{0,ldte}(y,\mathbf{x})$, and for $d \in \{0,1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} I^{d,ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) \equiv (2d-1) \Bigg\{ & \mathbb{E}^{km}\left[\frac{1\{Q \le y\}}{q_0(\mathbf{X})} 1\{\mathbf{X} \le \mathbf{x}\} \,|D=d, Z=1\right] \mathbb{P}(D=d, Z=1) \\ & -\mathbb{E}^{km}\left[\frac{1\{Q \le y\}}{1-q_0(\mathbf{X})} 1\{\mathbf{X} \le \mathbf{x}\} \,|D=d, Z=0\right] \mathbb{P}(D=d, Z=0) \Bigg\} \end{aligned}$$

Then, as discussed in Section 2.3, our KS type test statistic for hypothesis (4.3) is

$$KS_n^{ldte} = \sqrt{n} \sup_{(y,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W}} \left| \hat{I}_n^{ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) \right|,$$

where $\hat{I}_n^{ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) = \hat{I}_n^{1,ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) - \hat{I}_n^{0,ldte}(y,\mathbf{x})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}_n^{1,ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{n_{11}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{11}} W_{in_{11}} \frac{1\{Q_{1:n_{11}} \le y\} 1\{\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_{11}]} \le \mathbf{x}\}}{\hat{q}_n(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_{11}]})} \\ &\quad - \frac{n_{10}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{10}} W_{in_{10}} \frac{1\{Q_{1:n_{10}} \le y\} 1\{\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_{10}]} \le \mathbf{x}\}}{1-\hat{q}_n(\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_{10}]})}, \\ \hat{I}_n^{0,ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{n_{00}}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{00}} W_{jn_{00}} \frac{1\{Q_{j:n_{00}} \le y\} 1\{\mathbf{X}_{[j:n_{00}]} \le \mathbf{x}\}}{1-\hat{q}_n(\mathbf{X}_{[j:n_{00}]})} \\ &\quad - \frac{n_{01}}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{01}} W_{jn_{01}} \frac{1\{Q_{j:n_{01}} \le y\} 1\{\mathbf{X}_{[j:n_{01}]} \le \mathbf{x}\}}{\hat{q}_n(\mathbf{X}_{[j:n_{01}]})} \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{q}_n(\cdot)$ is the SLE for $q_0(\cdot)$, $n_{dz} = \sum_{i=1}^n 1\{D=d\}1\{Z=z\}$, $d,z \in \{0,1\}$, and for $1 \le i \le n_{dz}$, $Q_{1:n_{dz}} \le \cdots \le Q_{n_{dz}:n_{dz}}$ are the ordered Q-values in the sub-sample with $\{D=d, Z=z\}$, $\mathbf{X}_{[i:n_{dz}]}$ and $\delta_{[i:n_{dz}]}$ are the $\mathbf{X}$ and δ paired with $Q_{i:n_{dz}}$, and

$$W_{in_{dz}} = \frac{\delta_{[i:n_{dz}]}}{n_{dz}-i+1} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \left[\frac{n_{dz}-j}{n_{dz}-j+1}\right]^{\delta_{[j:n_{dz}]}} \tag{4.4}$$

is the Kaplan-Meier weights for the sub-sample with $\{D=d, Z=z\}$.

In the next theorem, we establish the asymptotic properties of KS_n^{ldte}. Let $c_{\alpha,n}^{ldte,*}$ denote the bootstrap critical value of the KS_n^{ldte}.

Theorem 7 *Suppose Assumptions 4.1-4.2 are satisfied. Further, suppose that for the subpopulation of compliers, Assumption A.2, A.3, and A.6 stated in the Appendix are satisfied are satisfied, and that q_0 and its SLE $\hat{q}_n$ satisfy the analogous of Assumptions A.4 and A.5. Then,*

1. *Under H_0^{ldte}, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ KS_n^{ldte} > c_{\alpha,n}^{ldte,*} \right\} = \alpha$.*
2. *Under H_1^{ldte}, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ KS_n^{ldte} > c_{\alpha,n}^{ldte,*} \right\} = 1$.*
3. *Under $H_{1,n}^{ldte}$: $\Upsilon^{ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} h^{ldte}(y,\mathbf{x})$ $\forall (y,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W}$, if $h^{ldte}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is an integrable function, and the set $h_n^{ldte} \equiv \left\{ (y,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W} : n^{-1/2} h^{ldte}(y,\mathbf{x}) \neq 0 \right\}$ has positive Lebesgue measure, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ KS_n^{ldte} > c_{\alpha,n}^{ldte,*} \right\} > \alpha$.*

The results of Theorem 7 are related to Abadie (2002). In the absence of censoring, Abadie (2002) propose a test for the unconditional analogue of H_0^{ldte}. Of course, by taking $w(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}) = 1$ *a.s.*, we are back to Abadie (2002) proposal. Thus, one may interpret Theorem 7 as extensions of Abadie (2002) in two different dimensions: it allows for covariates, and also for randomly censored outcomes. We are not aware of other proposal that can accommodate either these features.

5 Monte Carlo simulations

In this section, we conduct a small scale Monte Carlo exercise in order to study the finite sample properties of our test statistics for the null hypotheses (2.1), (4.1) and (4.2). The $\{V_i\}_{i=}^n$ used in the bootstrap implementations are independently generated as V with $\mathbb{P}(V = 1-\kappa) = \kappa/\sqrt{5}$ and $\mathbb{P}(V = \kappa) = 1 - \kappa/\sqrt{5}$, where $\kappa = \left(\sqrt{5}+1\right)/2$, as proposed by Mammen (1993). The bootstrap critical values are approximated by Monte Carlo using $1,000$ replications and the simulations are based on $10,000$ Monte Carlo experiments. We report rejection probabilities at the 5% significance level. Results for 10% and 1% significance levels are similar and available upon request.

We consider the following three designs:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(i)\,. \quad & Y(0) = 1 + X + \varepsilon(0)\,,\ Y(1) = 1 + X + \varepsilon(1)\,, \\
& C(0) = C(1) \sim a_1 + b_1 \times Exponential(1)\,; \\
(ii)\,. \quad & Y(0) = 1 + X + e(0)\,,\ Y(1) = 2 + X + e(1)\,, \\
& C(0) = C(1) \sim a_2 + b_2 \times Exponential(1)\,; \\
(iii)\,. \quad & Y(0) = 1 + X + e(1)\,,\ Y(1) = 1 + 3X + e(1)\,, \\
& C(0) = C(1) \sim a_3 + b_3 \times Exponential(1)\,;
\end{aligned}
$$

where X is distributed as $U[0,1]$, independently of $e(0), e(1), C(0)$ and $C(1)$, $\varepsilon(0)$ and $\varepsilon(1)$ are independent standard normal random variables, and the parameters a and b are chosen such that the percentage of censoring is equal to 0, 10 or 30 percent in the whole sample. In all designs, $\mathbb{P}(D=1|X) = \exp(-0.5X)/(1+\exp(-0.5X))$. When testing (2.1) and (4.1), Design (i) fall under the null, whereas Designs $(ii)-(iii)$ fall under the alternative. When testing (4.2), Designs $(i)-(ii)$ fall under the null, and Design (iii) fall under the alternative. We set $\bar{\tau} = \infty$ when testing (4.1) and (4.2).

We report the proportion of rejections for sample sizes $n = 100$, 300 and 500. We estimate $p(\cdot)$ using the SLE: with $n = 100$ we use $1, X$, with $n = 300$ we use $1, X, X^2$, and with $n = 500$ we use $1, X, X^2, X^3$ as power functions in the estimation procedure. The proportion of rejections for our tests are presented in Table 1. KS_n and CvM_n stands for the KS and CvM test statistics for the null of zero conditional distributional treatment effect. KS_n^{cate} and CvM_n^{cate} are the analogous test statistics for the null of zero conditional average treatment effect, and $KS_n^{\hom}$ and $CvM_n^{\hom}$ for the null of homogeneous average treatment effect across covariate values.

We observe that our tests exhibits good size accuracy even when $n = 100$. When the censoring level is 30%, we have that the proposed tests have size below their nominal levels, but as we increase the sample size, such size distortions are minimized. With respect to

Table 1: Empirical rejection probabilities, in percentage points.

DGP	Censoring	n	KS_n	CvM_n	KS_n^{cate}	CvM_n^{cate}	KS_n^{hom}	CvM_n^{hom}
(i)	0	100	5.38	5.27	5.33	4.97	5.42	4.91
(i)	10	100	5.32	5.07	4.80	4.74	5.15	4.82
(i)	30	100	3.79	5.46	4.07	4.35	3.72	3.92
(ii)	0	100	97.52	98.50	99.04	98.93	5.85	5.10
(ii)	10	100	97.27	98.43	95.24	94.40	4.70	4.54
(ii)	30	100	76.28	95.86	52.74	52.98	4.19	4.14
(iii)	0	100	94.78	89.51	97.18	89.54	27.72	48.22
(iii)	10	100	92.33	86.65	91.58	80.91	16.22	27.32
(iii)	30	100	73.57	78.96	61.08	52.45	7.11	9.84
(i)	0	300	5.33	5.00	5.45	5.34	5.44	5.54
(i)	10	300	5.31	5.10	4.94	4.59	4.73	4.32
(i)	30	300	4.34	5.48	3.99	4.44	3.79	4.28
(ii)	0	300	100	100	100	100	5.16	4.83
(ii)	10	300	100	100	100	100	4.74	4.68
(ii)	30	300	99.51	100	92.81	92.53	4.17	4.39
(iii)	0	300	100	100	100	100	94.27	99.42
(iii)	10	300	100	100	100	100	66.50	84.70
(iii)	30	300	99.81	99.95	97.67	95.02	22.42	33.66
(i)	0	500	5.04	5.32	5.31	5.20	5.66	5.53
(i)	10	500	5.21	4.93	5.17	4.95	5.02	4.61
(i)	30	500	4.62	5.38	4.14	4.35	4.45	4.34
(ii)	0	500	100	100	100	100	5.61	5.13
(ii)	10	500	100	100	100	100	5.05	4.72
(ii)	30	500	99.96	100	98.77	98.53	4.42	4.79
(iii)	0	500	100	100	100	100	100	100
(iii)	10	500	100	100	100	99.99	91.41	97.76
(iii)	30	500	99.99	100	99.78	99.22	39.03	53.51

power, our KS and CvM test statistics reach satisfactory levels for $n = 100$, the only exception being when testing for homogeneous ATE with censoring level of 30%. Nonetheless, as we sample size increases, all tests present satisfactory power properties, regardless of the censoring level considered. As one should expect, the power of all tests increases with sample size, and decreases with the degree of censoring. Overall, these simulations show that the proposed bootstrap tests exhibit excellent finite sample properties.

6 Illinois Reemployment Bonus Experiment

In this section, we demonstrate that our proposed tests can be useful in practice. We analyze data from the Illinois Reemployment Bonus Experiments, which is freely available

at the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

From mid-1984 to mid-1985, the Illinois Department of Employment Security conducted a social experiment to test the effectiveness of bonus offers in reducing the duration of insured unemployment At the beginning of each claim, the experiment randomly divided newly unemployed people into three groups:

1. Job Search Incentive Group (JSI). The members of this group were told that they would qualify for a cash bonus of $500, which was about four times the average weekly unemployment insurance benefits, if they found a full-time job within eleven weeks of benefits, and if they held that job for at least four months. 4816 claimants were assigned to this group.

2. Hiring Incentive Group (HI). The members of this group were told that their employer would qualify for a cash bonus of $500 if the claimant found a full-time job within eleven weeks of benefits, and if they held that job for at least four months. 3963 claimants were assigned to this group.

3. Control Group. All claimants not assigned to the other groups. These members did not know that the experiment was taking place. 3952 individuals were assigned to this group.

An important aspect of the Illinois Reemployment Bonus Experiment is that participation was not mandatory. Once claimants were assigned to the treatment groups, they were asked if they would like to participate in the demonstration or not. For those selected to the Job Search Incentive group, 84% agreed to participate, whereas just 65% of the Hiring Incentive group agreed to participate.

Several studies including Woodbury and Spiegelman (1987), and Meyer (1996) have analyzed the impact of the reemployment bonus on the unemployment duration measured by the number of weeks receiving unemployment insurance. Spells which reached the maximum

amount of benefits or the state maximum number of weeks, 26, are censored, leading to censoring proportions of 38, 41 and 42 percent for the JSI, HI and the control group, respectively. Apart from the duration data, some information about claimants' background characteristics is also available: age, gender (Male =1), ethnicity (White =1), pre-unemployment earning and the weekly unemployment insurance benefits amount. For a complete description of the experiment and the available dataset, see Woodbury and Spiegelman (1987).

Our goal in this application is to assess the effect of reemployment bonuses on unemployment duration. Given the differences between JSI and HI, we analyze these two treatments separately. That is, we consider two sub-samples: one with individuals who are in JSI or in the control group, and one with individuals who are in HI or in the control group. Furthermore, we consider we consider two type of analysis. First, we consider an intention to treat (ITT) analysis, where $D = 1$ if an individual is offered to participate in the demonstration, and $D = 0$ if an individual was in the control group. In this case, we completely ignore the non-compliance with treatment allocations. Second, in an attempt to disentangle the effects of being offered and actually receiving treatment, we consider a local treatment effect analysis, using the random assignment as an instrumental variable.

Table 2 reports the results of all our proposed tests, based on 10,000 bootstrap replications. We consider the nulls of (a) zero conditional (local) DTE, (b) zero conditional (local) ATE, and (c) homogeneous (local) ATE across covariate values. The conditioning vector considered consist of all available claimants characteristics described above.

To implement all tests, we estimate the propensity score $p_0(\cdot)$ and the instrument propensity score $q_0(\cdot)$ using the SLE where all covariates enters the model linearly. Given that the data comes from an experimental design, consistency of the propensity score models is guaranteed.

Let us start interpreting the results for the JSI sample. For both ITT and LTE setup we reject the null of zero conditional (local) DTE at the 5% level using either the Kolmogorov-Smirnov or the Cramér-von Mises test statistic. Such an evidence suggests that offering

Table 2: Bootstrap p-values for different tests for treatment effect heterogeneity based on the Illinois bonus experiment.

Intention to Treat				
	Job Search Incentive Group		Hiring Incentive Group	
Null Hypothesis / Test type	KS	CvM	KS	CvM
Zero Conditional DTE	0.0001	0.0122	0.0618	0.1516
Zero Conditional ATE	0.0335	0.0686	0.1533	0.2167
Homogeneous Conditional ATE	0.0319	0.0992	0.5568	0.6505
Local Treatment Effects - Compliers				
	Job Search Incentive Group		Hiring Incentive Group	
Null Hypothesis / Test type	KS	CvM	KS	CvM
Zero Conditional Local DTE	0.0001	0.0105	0.0598	0.1559
Zero Conditional Local ATE	0.0386	0.0766	0.1589	0.2191
Homogeneous Conditional Local ATE	0.5910	0.5851	0.9949	0.9725

reemployment bonus to job-searchers has affected the distribution of unemployment duration.

To shed some light on which part of the distribution is affected, we test the null of zero conditional (truncated) ATE as in (4.1). In the LTE setup, we consider the analogous null of zero conditional local (truncated) ATE

$$H_0^{clate} : \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}^{clate}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \chi_X,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}^{clate}(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbb{E}\left[Y(1) 1\left\{Y(1) \leq \bar{\tau}\right\} | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, pop = comp\right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}\left[Y(0) 1\left\{Y(0) \leq \bar{\tau}\right\} | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, pop = comp\right]. \end{aligned}$$

For details about how one can construct tests for H_0^{clate}, see the Supplementary Appendix.

We set $\bar{\tau} = 26$, so all the available data is used. From Table 2, we have that H_0^{cate} and H_0^{clate} are both rejected at the 5% level when using the KS test, and at the 10% level when using the CvM test. Such an evidence suggests that reemployment bonus has affected the average unemployment duration. However, we note that Sant'Anna (2016) unconditional (restricted) ATE and LATE estimators are -0.2221 and 1.9745, respectively, and both are not statistically significant at the 10% level. Thus, a researcher who relied only on "traditional" unconditional tests of a zero average effect would have missed the presence

of treatment effects in this program.

When conditional (local) ATE is heterogeneous, it may be harder to identify the sub-population of individuals that the treatment effect is non-zero. However, if the conditional ATE is homogeneous, the task is trivial. With this in mind, we test the null of homogenous conditional (truncated) ATE as in (4.2). In the LTE setup, we consider the analogous null of homogenous conditional local (truncated) ATE,

$$H_0^{l\,\text{hom}} : \exists\ \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}^{l} \in \mathbb{R} : \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}^{clate}(\mathbf{x}) = \Upsilon_{\bar{\tau}}^{l}\ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \chi_X.$$

For details about how one can construct tests for $H_0^{l\,\text{hom}}$, see the Supplementary Appendix.

As before, we set $\bar{\tau} = 26$. For the ITT setup, the null of homogeneous conditional ATE is rejected at the 5% level when using the KS test, and at the 10% level when using the CvM test. When the endogeneity of the selection into treatment is taken into account, we fail to reject the null of homogenous conditional local (truncated) ATE at usual confidence levels. From these results, one concludes that the average treatment effect of being offered versus not being offered into the bonus experiment is heterogeneous. On the other hand, once we restrict our attention to the complier subpopulation, we fail to find enough evidence against the null of homogeneous ATE of actually participating in the JSI program versus not participating.

Next, we analyze the results for the HI sub-sample. Interesting enough, at the 5% level we fail to reject each considered null hypothesis regardless of the test statistic used. This finding suggests that offering a reemployment bonus to the employer does not affect the time unemployed individuals take to find a job at all.

Overall, the results of our proposed tests suggest that offering an unemployment bonus to the job searcher was effective in changing the length of the unemployment spell. On the other hand, offering the bonus to the employer rather than to the job-searcher seems to be ineffective in changing the unemployment duration.

Appendix A Technical Assumptions

We first present the technical Assumptions needed for our main results. Let $\mathcal{C}_b\left(\mathbb{R}^k\right)$ be the space of all bounded, continuous, complex-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^k$.

Assumption A.1 *The class of functions* $\mathcal{F} = \left\{w\left(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x}\right) : \mathbf{X} \in \chi_{_X} \subset \mathbb{R}^k\right\}$ *satisfy one of the following conditions:*

(i) $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{C}_b\left(\mathbb{R}^k\right)$ *is a vector lattice that contains the constant functions and separates points of* $\mathbb{R}^k$.

(ii) $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{C}_b\left(\mathbb{R}^k\right)$ *is an algebra that contains the constant functions and separates points of* $\mathbb{R}^k$.

(iii) $\mathcal{F} = \left\{w\left(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{X}\right) : \mathbf{X} \in \chi_{_X} \subset \mathbb{R}^k\right\}$ *and* w *is an analytic function that is non-polynomial, where* $\chi_{_X}$ *is a compact set of* $\mathbb{R}^k$ *containing the origin.*

(iv) $\mathcal{F} = \left\{1\left(\mathbf{X} \in B_x\right) : \mathbf{X} \in \chi_{_X} \subset \mathbb{R}^k\right\}$ *and* $\left\{B_x\right\}_{x \in \chi_{_X}}$ *is a separating class of Borel sets of* $\mathbb{R}^k$.

Assumption A.1 states the conditions on w such that Lemma 2 holds. These conditions are exactly the same as those in Escanciano (2006) Lemma 1.

Assumption A.2 *(i) The support* $\chi_{_X}$ *of the* k*-dimensional covariate* $\mathbf{X}$ *is a Cartesian product of compact intervals,* $\chi_{_X} = \prod_{j=1}^{k}\left[x_{lj}, x_{uj}\right]$;

(ii) The density of $\mathbf{X}$ *is bounded, and bounded away from 0 on* $\chi_{_X}$

Assumption A.3 *For* $d \in \{0,1\}$, $F_{Y(d)|X}\left(y|\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\right)$ *is* m*-times continuously differentiable in* x*, for all* $(y, \mathbf{x}) \in \chi_{_{Y,X}}$, $m \geq k$.

Assumption A.4 *For all* $\mathbf{x} \in \chi_{_X}$, *the propensity score* $p_0\left(\mathbf{x}\right)$ *is continuously differentiable of order* $s \geq 13k$, *where* k *is the dimension of* X.

Assumption A.5 *The series logit estimator of* $p_0\left(\mathbf{x}\right)$ *uses a power series with* $L = a \cdot N^v$ *for some* $a > 0$ *and* $1/\left(s/k - 2\right) < v < 1/11$.

Assumption A.6 *For* $d \in \{0,1\}$, *assume that, for all* $(y, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1\left\{Q\left(d\right) \leq y\right\} 1\left\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\right\} \gamma_{d,0}\left(Q\right) \delta_d\right)^2\right] &< \infty, \\ \mathbb{E}\left[1\left\{Q\left(d\right) \leq y\right\} 1\left\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\right\} C_d^{1/2}\left(Y\right)\right] &< \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_{d,0}$ *is defined as in (3.1),*

$$C_d\left(w\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{w-} \frac{G_d(dy)}{\left[1 - H_d\left(y\right)\right]\left[1 - G_d\left(y\right)\right]},$$

and $G_d\left(w\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(C \leq w, D = d\right)$.

Assumption A.7 *For $d \in \{0,1\}$, $E(Y(d)|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x})$ is m-times continuously differentiable in x, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \chi_x$, $m \geq k$.*

Assumption A.8 *For $d \in \{0,1\}$, assume that, for all $(y,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{W}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(Q(d)\,1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}\,\gamma_{d,0}(Q)\,\delta_d\right)^2\right] < \infty,$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Q(d)\,1\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}\}\,C_d^{1/2}(Y)\right] < \infty. \tag{A.1}$$

Similar assumptions have adopted by Hirano et al. (2003), Crump et al. (2008), Donald and Hsu (2014), among others. Assumptions A.2, A.3 and A.7 restrict the distribution of $\mathbf{X}$ and $Y(d)$ and requires that all covariates are continuous. Nonetheless, at the expense of additional notation, we can deal with the case where $\mathbf{X}$ has both continuous and discrete components by means of sample splitting based on the discrete covariates. In order to avoid cumbersome notation, we abstract from this point in the rest of the paper. Assumption A.4 requires sufficient smoothness of the propensity score, whereas Assumption A.5 restrict the rate at which additional terms are added to the series approximation of $p(\mathbf{x})$, depending on the dimension of $\mathbf{X}$ and the number of derivatives of $p(\mathbf{x})$. The restriction on the derivatives in Assumption A.4 guarantees the existence of a v that satisfy the conditions in Assumption A.5. Assumptions A.6 and A.8 are standard with censored data; they guarantee that the variance of the Kaplan-Meier integral related to the DTE and ATE is finite, and their bias are $o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$. See Stute (1996) and Chen and Lo (1997) for a detailed discussion.

References

Abadie, A. (2002), "Bootstrap tests for distributional treatment effects in instrumental variable models," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97(457), 284–292.

Abadie, A. (2003), "Semiparametric instrumental variable estimation of treatment response models," *Journal of Econometrics*, 113, 231–263.

Abbring, J. H., and van den Berg, G. J. (2003), "The nonparametric identification of treatment effects in duration models," *Econometrica*, 71(5), 1491–1517.

Angrist, J. D., Imbens, G. W., and Rubin, D. B. (1996), "Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91(434), 444–455.

Anstrom, K. J., and Tsiatis, a. a. (2001), "Utilizing propensity scores to estimate causal treatment effects with censored time-lagged data.," *Biometrics*, 57(4), 1207–1218.

Baker, S. G. (1998), "Analysis of survival data from a randomized trial with all-or-none compliance: estimating the cost-effectiveness of a cancer screening program," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(443), 929–934.

Bang, H., and Tsiatis, A. (2000), "Estimating medical costs with censored data," *Biometrika*, 87(2), 329–343.

Barker, C. (2009), "The Mean, Median, and Confidence Intervals of the Kaplan-Meier Survival Estimate-Computations and Applications," *The American Statistician*, 63(1), 78–80.

Bierens, H. J. (1982), "Consistent model specification tests," *Journal of Econometrics*, 20(1982), 105–134.

Bierens, H. J., and Ploberger, W. (1997), "Asymptotic theory of integrated conditional moment tests," *Econometrica*, 65(5), 1129–1151.

Bitler, M. O., Gelbach, J. B., and Hoynes, H. H. (2006), "What mean impacts miss: Distributional effects of welfare reform experiments," *The American Economic Review*, 96(4), 988–1012.

Bitler, M. O., Gelbach, J. B., and Hoynes, H. H. (2016), "Can Variation in Subgroups' Average Treatment Effects Explain Treatment Effect Heterogeneity? Evidence from a Social Experiment," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, .

Bitler, M. P., Gelbach, J. B., and Hoynes, H. W. (2008), "Distributional impacts of the Self-Sufficiency Project," *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(3-4), 748–765.

Blundell, R., and Powell, J. L. (2007), "Censored regression quantiles with endogenous regressors," *Journal of Econometrics*, 141(1), 65–83.

Chen, K., and Lo, S.-H. (1997), "On the rate of uniform convergence of the product-limit estimator: strong and weak laws," *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(3), 1050–1087.

Crump, R. K., Hotz, V. J., Imbens, G. W., and Mitnik, O. A. (2008), "Nonparametric tests for treatment effect heterogeneity," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(3), 389–405.

Ding, P., Feller, A., and Miratrix, L. (2015), "Randomization inference for treatment effect variation," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, .

Donald, S. G., and Hsu, Y.-C. (2014), "Estimation and inference for distribution functions and quantile functions in treatment effect models," *Journal of Econometrics*, 178(3), 383–397.

Escanciano, J. C. (2006), "Goodness-of-Fit Tests for Linear and Nonlinear Time Series Models," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(474), 531–541.

Fan, Y., and Li, Q. (1996), "Consistent model specification tests: omitted variables and semiparametric functional forms," *Econometrica*, 64(4), 865–890.

Frandsen, B. R. (2015), "Treatment Effects With Censoring and Endogeneity," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(512), 1745–1752.

Frangakis, C. E., Frangakis, C. E., Rubin, D. B., and Rubin, D. B. (1999), "Addressing complications of intention-to-treat analysis in the combined presence of all-or-none treatment-noncompliance and subsequent missing outcomes," *Biometrika*, 86(2), 365–379.

Giné, E., and Zinn, J. (1990), "Bootstrapping general empirical measures," *The Annals of Probability*, 18(2), 851–869.

Ham, J. C., and Lalonde, R. J. (1996), "The effect of sample selection and initial conditions in duration models: Evidence from experimental data on training," *Econometrica*, 64(1), 175–205.

Hirano, K., Imbens, G. W., and Ridder, G. (2003), "Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score," *Econometrica*, 71(4), 1161–1189.

Honore, B., Khan, S., and Powell, J. (2002), "Quantile regression under random censoring," *Journal of Econometrics*, 109, 67–105.

Hotz, V. J., Imbens, G. W., and Mortimer, J. H. (2005), "Predicting the efficacy of future training programs using past experiences at other locations," *Journal of Econometrics*, 125, 241–270.

Imbens, G. W., and Angrist, J. D. (1994), "Identification and estimation of local average treatment effects," *Econometrica*, 62(2), 467–475.

Imbens, G. W., and Wooldridge, J. M. (2009), "Recent developments in the econometrics of program evaluation," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47(1), 5–86.

Kaplan, E. L., and Meier, P. (1958), "Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 53(282), 457–481.

Lee, M.-J. (2009), "Non-parametric tests for distributional treatment effect for randomly censored responses," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 71(1), 243–264.

Lee, M.-J., and Lee, S.-J. (2005), "Analysis of job-training effects on Korean women," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 20(4), 549–562.

Mammen, E. (1993), "Bootstrap and wild bootstrap for high dimensional linear models," *The Annals of Statistics*, 21(1), 255–285.

Manski, C. F. (2004), "Statistical treatment rules for heterogeneous populations," *Econometrica*, 72(4), 1221–1246.

Meyer, B. D. (1996), "What have we learned from the Illinois reemployment bonus experiment?," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 14(1), 26–51.

Rosenbaum, P. R., and Rubin, D. B. (1983), "The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects," *Biometrika*, 70(1), 41–55.

Sant'Anna, P. H. C. (2016), "Program Evaluation with Right-Censored data," *Mimeo*, .

Sellero, C. S., González-Manteiga, W., and van Keilegom, I. (2005), "Uniform representation of product-limit integrals with applications," *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 32, 563–581.

Shorack, G. R., and Wellner, J. A. (1986), *Empirical processes with applications to statistics*, New York: Wiley.

Stinchcombe, M. B., and White, H. (1998), "Consistent specification testing with nuisance parameters present only under the alternative," *Econometric theory*, 14, 295–325.

Stute, W. (1993), "Consistent estimation under random censorship when covariables are present," *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 45, 89 – 103.

Stute, W. (1995), "The central limit theorem under random censorship," *The Annals of Statistics*, 23(2), 422–439.

Stute, W. (1996), "Distributional convergence under random censorship when covariables are present," *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 23(4), 461–471.

Stute, W. (1997), "Nonparametric model checks for regression," *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(2), 613–641.

Stute, W., and Wang, J.-L. (1993), "The strong law under random censorship," *The Annals of Statistics*, 21(3), 1591–1607.

van der Vaart, A. W., and Wellner, J. A. (1996), *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*, New York: Springer.

Woodbury, S. A., and Spiegelman, R. G. (1987), "Bonuses to workers and employers to reduce unemployment: Randomized trials in Illinois," *The American Economic Review*, 77(4), 513–530.

Zucker, D. M. (1998), "Restricted Mean Life With Covariates : Modification and Extension of a Useful Survival Analysis Method," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(442), 702–709.